**Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.**—With reference to answer (*b*), will the Government please explain why there is so much delay in settling this question?

**Mr. PRESIDENT.**—Government know that there has been much delay in this matter. They will expedite the scheme as far as possible.

**Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.**—Do the Government know that the curb well which was sunk as an alternative scheme has proved a failure?

**Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.**—The report received by Government says that the experiment has been successful.

**Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.**—Are the Government aware that the well has been sunk by the side of the stream and water from the stream is diverted into it and that the Director of Health who inspected the well has certified that the water is unhealthy and unsuitable for drinking purposes?

**Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.**—No.

**Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.**—How long will the Government take to dispose of this question?

**Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.**—If possible, within a month or two

## Police-firing in Bangalore in October 1937.

*Q.*—37. **Messrs. T. C. BASAPPA,** Tarikere Taluk, and **T. V. NARASINGAPPA,** Tarikere Municipality.—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether the Magistrate present was not on the spot when the Police opened fire in October 1937 in Bangalore;

(*b*) whether his permission was obtained before opening fire;

(*c*) in the absence of such permission, what punishment has been inflicted upon the officer who allowed the opening of fire?

*A.*—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. H. V. Ramasvami).**

(*a*) No.

(*b*) No. Opened in self-defence.

(*c*) For answer please *vide* reply to sub-section (*b*); No punishment is called for in cases of self-defence.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Was either the District Magistrate or the City Magistrate present at the spot when fire was opened?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—No.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Was any of those two officers present at the spot just before the fire was opened?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—No.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Where had both these officers gone while shooting was going on?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—They had gone elsewhere.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Was fire opened under the orders of any magistrate?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—Please see the printed answer to the question.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—What were the circumstances which necessitated the opening of fire?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—The circumstances have been detailed in the press communique issued by the Government.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Had any of the policemen or officers received any injuries before the shooting took place?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—That question also has been dealt with in the press communique.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Have the Government satisfied themselves that fire was opened in self-defence?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—Yes.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Is it a fact that the police caused needless trouble and harassment to the public?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—No.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—On whose report are the Government depending in stating that fire was opened in self-defence?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—On the report of the local officers who were on the spot and also on verification of the facts reported.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Has the District Magistrate made any report to the Government on this question?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—Yes.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Since he himself was not present on the spot when fire was opened, on whose report did he base his own report to the Government?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—On the report of the subordinate officers who were present.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Who were they?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—The police officers.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Which officer exactly gave orders to open fire?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—The senior police officer.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—Was that senior officer competent to issue orders to open fire?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—Simply because he happened to be a police officer, he could not be divested of his right to fire in pure self-defence.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—What were the exact incidents leading up to the police opening fire?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—Some of the police were hit badly with stones.

**Mr. T. C. BASAPPA.**—How many were they?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—Please see the communique for such details.

**Mr. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO.**—Did the senior police officer give orders to fire in exercise of his right of self-defence or in exercise of discharging his official duties?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—One may connote the other also.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA.**—Is it a fact that the District Magistrate was not present on the spot at the time fire was opened?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—Yes.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA.**—Was not the Inspector-General of Police also present at the time along with the District Magistrate?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—No.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA.**—Did not Mr. B. L. Byanna and some others interview the District Magistrate and represent to him to order the withdrawal of the police, in which case the interviewers would be able to pacify the crowds?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—That was an hour after the firing.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA.**—Is it not a fact that the Inspector-General of Police stated that for every round which was fired, 50 people should fall dead?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—No.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA.**—Is it not a fact that the students were marching in a very peaceful manner?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—I do not know.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA.**—Is it not a fact that the District Magistrate saw one dead body soon after the firing?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—No.

**Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO.**—Is it not a fact that the police needlessly obstructed the students who were marching and formed a cordon around them and beat them even though no provocation was caused?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—I do not know, because, I was not present.

**Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO.**—Is it not a fact that the students who were beaten simply ran away thereafter?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—All that I know is that there was some disturbance caused by the students and others near the Intermediate College and that the police went and brought the situation under control.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—On the day in question, was not the City Magistrate (Mr. Guru Dutt) posted for duty at the spot?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—That was one of his normal duties. He was present at the spot.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—When fire was opened, was not the City Magistrate sitting in his car near the margosa tree in the District Office compound?

**Mr. PRESIDENT.**—I do not think it is necessary for you to cross-examine the Chief Secretary in this manner.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—It would not have been necessary for me to put these questions in this manner if my earlier questions had been answered satisfactorily. Mr. Guru Dutt was present along with us near the mango grove when people were shot at. In fact he was shivering with nervousness and we had to request him to permit us to arrest the progress of the mob. Let me point out that the firing was in the hands of the Anglo-Indian sergeants and no superior officer was present on the spot at the time. But for our stopping the mob, I do not know what would have been the fate of all the people who had gathered there. The police were simply running away with their rifles. They were coming towards us. These are the bare facts. But they are not forthcoming in the course of the replies

of Government. My question is when there was a responsible magistrate available near the spot, why should the sergeants have resorted to firing without obtaining any permission from that magistrate, more especially because no provocation was offered to them by anybody? Myself and many other lawyers were eye-witnesses to the incidents. I thank the Dewan for having acknowledged our services; but it is a pity that the communique issued by the Government is not true to facts. It is not correct to state that fire was opened in self-defence. I may therefore be permitted to ask whether the District Magistrate was not present inside his office at the time the shooting took place.

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—No.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Where was he then?

**Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.**—He had gone home.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—When did he come back?

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).**—That is cross-examination again. Besides, the incident itself is 8 months old. The question as to where exactly a particular officer was at a particular moment on that date necessarily requires some notice.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Is it a fact or not that the lawyers who were present there requested the District Magistrate to give them charge of the situation so that they might bring the crowd under control?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—The District Magistrate says that all that took place after the event.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—It is a relevant question whether the City Magistrate, whose duty it was to be on the spot so as to be able to give necessary orders in case of emergency, was actually present on the spot or not.

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—That question has already been answered, *viz.*, that no magistrate was present at the time on the spot and that the senior police officer who was present had to open fire in self-defence.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Who is that officer may I know—at least his rank?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—I shall obtain and give the information.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Very well; I may however be permitted to state that public sense of justice has been rudely shaken of late in Mysore, and I am constrained to say that the Government have not met our expectations properly. Even now, it will be well if they take the public into their confidence and give out the entire truth in all such cases.

**Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.**—I have also sent up a question relating to this very matter. That question has been answered in the second set of printed answers placed on the table of the House. I may therefore be permitted to ask in this connection how exactly the Government satisfied themselves that fire was opened in pure self-defence.

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—They received necessary reports in the matter and they also came to the same conclusion.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Were they all police reports?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—Some of them were. But there were the District Magistrate's report and other reports also.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Did the District Magistrate hold any independent inquiry before submitting his report to the Government?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—Yes, though not a regular enquiry in the strict judicial sense.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Did he make inquiries of persons other than the police?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—He might have.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Did the District Magistrate elicit from any non-officials the opinion that fire was opened in self-defence?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—Notice.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Did the Government at least satisfy themselves that the District Magistrate's report contained all the facts?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—Government had no reason to doubt

the accuracy of the District Magistrate's report.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Are the Government aware that many newspapers have expressed the opinion that the opening of fire on that occasion was not justified ?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—Yes, but the Government held a different opinion.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—If the police officers had not stated that they had opened fire in self-defence on the occasion in question, the Government would have dismissed them, is it not ?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—That is a hypothetical question.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Do the Government expect the police officers to confess that they were not right in opening fire ?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—That is not a supplementary question.

**Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR.**—Is it not a fact that suggestions from many quarters were received that a committee of enquiry should be appointed with regard to this firing ?

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.**—Under the circumstances of the case, Government did not consider it necessary to appoint a committee of enquiry.

**Mr. A. J. KHALEEL.**—I was also an eye-witness to the incidents of that day. At about 11 A.M., young boys in large numbers collected road metal, jelly, brick-bats and so on and went on pelting them at the policemen. The policemen were therefore moving from place to place. I went to some lawyers who were in the court and were dressed in khaddar and requested them to go and see that the students quietly dispersed. The lawyers did not intervene at that stage. They went to the place long after the firing was over and subsequently some of them wrote articles in newspapers. My own feeling is that if the police had not opened fire, many lives should have been lost. It was a fact that half the hooligans of the city were all concentrated at the place.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA.**—Even then, the fact remains that the police opened fire without giving any notice whatever to the crowd.

## ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

**Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR** then represented that he and some other members of the House had given notice of an adjournment motion relating to the transfer of certain officers in the Kolar District with a view to facilitating the work of the Committee appointed by the Government in connection with the Viduraswatha disturbances of April 1938, and enquired whether the adjournment motion was admitted by the President.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari)** replied that the Viduraswatha Disturbances Enquiry Committee had received from the Counsel for the Public a letter suggesting the transfer of the officers referred to and that they had forwarded the letter to the Government for disposal. The Government had asked for the opinion of the Committee on the request made on behalf of the public and the Committee had replied that the transfer of the officers was desirable. In view of that opinion, the Government had just decided to effect the transfer. Accordingly, they communicated their decision to the Chairman of the Committee and action was being taken to issue orders transferring the officers. In these circumstances, Government considered that it was not necessary to allow the adjournment motion to be discussed. He hoped that the motion would be withdrawn by the signatories.

Thereupon **Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR,** on behalf of the requisitionists, withdrew the adjournment motion.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET—*concld.*

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** referred to the statement made by Mr. K. T. Bhashyam Aiyangar on the previous day to the effect that compared to the budgets of six or seven years ago, the Government had brought down the level of expenditure under General Administration by six lakhs of rupees. He requested Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar to explain to